Attorney Docket No. US010318

REMARKS

I.   INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 4, 12 and 16-19 have been amended. Claim 2, 8 and 11 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Thus claims 1, 3-7, 9-10 and 12-19 remain pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that based on the following remarks, all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The amended claims have merely incorporated the subject matter of previously examined dependent claim 11. No new search is needed because the Examiner has already considered and searched the recitations in the claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments should be entered because the subject matter has been previously considered and searched by Examiner.

II.   THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,243,707 to Humpleman et al. (hereinafter "Humpleman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,564 to Fontana et al. (hereinafter "Fontana") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,348 to Knowles et al. (hereinafter "Knowles"). (See 01/17/2008 Office Action, pp. 2-7, pp. 11-13).

Humpleman describes a system where the available content on multiple devices is combined into a single HTML program guide, which is available for viewing on any browser based home device. Humpleman states "in one embodiment of the invention, a process extracts the information from a particular EPG and converts it into a standard program format. The standard program format is then used to build an HTML program guide. The HTML program guide can be displayed on any browser based home device." (See Humpleman, col. 23, ll. 2-7). In addition, in Humpleman the HTML program guide is periodically updated simply to reflect the currently available programs. (See Humpleman, col. 23, ll. 7-9).

8

Claim 1 has been amended to recite,

> wherein the reference information object model is generated utilizing an iterative process in which an initial version of the model is generated using a first set of data specifications, and at least one subsequent version of the model is generated from the initial version using at least a second set of data specifications

The Examiner asserts that this recitation from cancelled claim 11 is taught by Humpleman's statement that "[l]ike the EPGs, the HTML program guide is periodically updated to reflect the currently available programs. As stated above, the user can customize the displayed HTML program guide to view only a particular set of the available information." (See 01/17/2008 Office Action p. 6).

The Examiner has specifically analogized a "newly updated original generic EPG" to a "second set of data specifications." (See 01/17/2008 Office Action p. 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees. EPG data specifications are clearly not equivalent to a newly updated original generic EPG that has been updated to reflect the currently available programs. As described above, in Humpleman the HTML program guide is periodically updated simply to reflect the currently available programs. (See Humpleman, col. 23, ll. 7-9). Thus, in Humpleman, the specifications remain the same to generate the newly updated original generic EPG. In Humpleman, it is only the content that changes in the EPG, not the specifications used to generate the content.

Claim 1 recites a "first set of data specifications" and a "second set of data specifications." Thus, in claim 1 there are at least two different set of data specifications used to generate the model. Therefore, Applicants submit that Humpleman does not teach or suggest the recitation of claim 1. Applicants further submit that neither Fontana nor Knowles cure the above-described deficiencies of Humpleman with respect to claim 1. Because claims 4-7 and 9-14 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

9

Attorney Docket No. US010318

Independent claim 19 recites,

> wherein the reference information object model is generated utilizing an iterative process in which an initial version of the model is generated using a first set of data specifications, and at least one subsequent version of the model is generated from the initial version using at least a second set of data specifications

Applicants submit that this claim is also allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Fontana and Knowles, in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0073081 to Kido (hereinafter "Kido"). (See 01/17/2008 Office Action, pp. 7-8).

Applicants submit that Kido does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Humpleman, Fontana, and Knowles with respect to claim 1. Because claims 3 and 15 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Fontana in further view of Kido. (See 01/17/2008 Office Action, pp. 8-13).

Claim 16 recites,

> wherein the reference information object model is generated utilizing an iterative process in which an initial version of the model is generated using a first set of data specifications, and at least one subsequent version of the reference information object model is generated from the initial version using at least a second set of data specifications.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

10

Attorney Docket No. US010318

Claim 17 recites,

> wherein the reference information object model is generated utilizing an iterative process in which an initial version of the model is generated using a first set of data specifications, and at least one subsequent version of the model is generated from the initial version using at least a second set of data specifications.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 18 recites,

> wherein the reference information object model is generated utilizing an iterative process in which an initial version of the model is generated using a first set of data specifications, and at least one subsequent version of the model is generated from the initial version using at least a second set of data specifications.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

11

Attorney Docket No. US010318

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 17, 2008

By: _____
Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276

12